

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is an independent claim. Claims 20-24 have been previously canceled.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,117,529 issued to Leising, *et al.* ("Leising"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Claim 1 recites *inter alia*:

A display using a photoluminescence quenching device, comprising:

an excitation light source for projecting light to the emitter layer;

an electrical field formed between the first electrode and the second electrode which controllably quenches the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer." (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that Leising fails to teach or suggest at least such features, more particularly, Leising fails to teach or suggest an excitation light source for projecting light to the emitter layer. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Leising discloses the excitation light source in columns 11 and 13, lines 46-49 (See Advisory Action and See Office Action on page 2, paragraph 5). Rather, Leising merely discloses a blue emitting diode, which emits blue light and converts the blue light into green and red light using a

color conversion medium (CCM). Although the word “excite” does appear in Leising, Applicant contends that it is improper to imply the use of an “excitation external light source”. According to Leising, “when a dye emitting in the green is illuminated with blue light, then the green dye is excited by the blue light and subsequently emits green light.” (See col. 13, lines 46-49). Therefore, the emitter layer emits only blue light and a dye layer (CCM) converts the blue light into green light. However, in the present invention, light generated by the excitation light source is not converted into green and red light, but used to trigger the emitter layer to emit blue, green or red light.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Leising fails to teach or suggest the electrical field controllably quenches the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer. Rather, Leising discloses a conventional organic light emitting display with an electric field required for the onset of current, where the application of high voltages to the electric field produces field-induced tunneling of charge carriers from the electrodes into the polymer, which is the predominant injection mechanism (See col. 13, lines 21-31), i.e. higher applied voltages create paths for charge carriers from the electrodes into the polymer, increasing the generation of exitons and increasing the emitted photoluminescence. In other words, Leising teaches the use of an electric field for increasing the electroluminescence of an electroluminescent color display screen, rather than use of an electric field for controllably quenching the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer, as disclosed in the present invention.

Accordingly, Leising fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-19. Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the

Michael REDECKER
Application No.: 10/612,975

claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: August 28, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP:BYC:kbs